

Serial No. 10/807,433

Docket No. RPL-0032

Amendment dated July 13, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 17, 2006

### REMARKS

Entry of the amended claims is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution without incorporating additional subject matter); (3) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; and/or (4) place the application in better form for appeal (if necessary). Entry is thus requested.

By the present response, Applicants have amended the specification and claims 1, 7 and 13 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-37 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 1-37 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Examiner indicated that the phrase "electrically separated" in claims 1, 7, and 13

Amendment dated July 13, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 17, 2006

requires the auxiliary metal electrodes to not be electrically connected to the metal electrodes, and asserts that this is considered new matter.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 7 and 13 to further clarify the invention and respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn. Specifically, the expression "the auxiliary metal electrodes are electrically separated from the metal electrodes" in claims 1 and 7 have been amended to "the auxiliary metal electrodes are separated from the metal electrodes by the transparent ITO electrodes." Similarly, the expression "so that are electrically separated from the main metal electrode pair" in claim 13 has been amended to "so that are separated from the main metal electrode pair by the transparent electrode pair." Applicants submit that these claim amendments do not contain any prohibited new matter and are supported in Applicants' specification and drawings.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-37 are respectfully requested.

Prior 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In the Office Action dated September 14, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No, 6,531,819 (Nakahara et al.). By the instant amendment, claims 1, 7 and 13 more clearly recite the subject matter of the present invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentable distinct from the cited prior art. Nakahara does not disclose or suggest at least "the auxiliary metal electrodes

Amendment dated July 13, 2006

Reply to Office Action of April 17, 2006

separated from the metal electrodes by the transparent ITO electrodes” as presently recited in independent claims 1 and 7, or “auxiliary metal electrode pair which are formed on the transparent electrode pair so that are separated from the main metal electrode pair by the transparent electrode pair” as presently recited in independent claim 13.

The auxiliary patterns 4 in Fig.6 of Nakahara prohibit a light from emitting in the plasma display panel. However, the auxiliary metal electrodes of the present invention provide large aperture to the plasma display panel. Therefore, the present invention has higher brightness than Nakahara. Further, the auxiliary metal electrodes of Nakahara are branch type, whereas in contrast, the auxiliary metal electrodes of the present invention are island type.

Regarding claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-37, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on independent claims 1, 7 and 13 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Nakahara does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-37 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. 10/807,433  
Amendment dated July 13, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of April 17, 2006

Docket No. RPL-0032

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-37 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186  
Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg

**Date: July 13, 2006**

\\Fk4\Documents\2028\2028-032\99398.doc

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**